UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/420,086	10/18/99	FARNWORTH W	98-0105.01

EXAMINER	
PAREKH, N	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2811	

MMC2/0703

STEPHEN A GRATTON
2764 SOUTH BRAUN WAY
LAKEWOOD CO 80228

DATE MAILED: 07/03/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/420,086	Farnworth et al
Examiner	**Art Unit**
Nitin Parekh	2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 11, 2001

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-39 and 47-53 is/are pending in the applica

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from considera

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-39 and 47-53 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirem

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 5 and 6

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hembree (prior art-IDS, US Pat. 5783461) in view of Frankeny et al (US Pat. 5065227) and Pedder (US Pat. 5717245).

Regarding claim 25, Hembree discloses a semiconductor component/package comprising:

- a composite substrate/interconnect (14/16 in Fig. 2) comprising a first surface with a conductive layer/trace (40, 56, 58, etc. in Fig. 2 and 4) and an opposing/second surface (31 in Fig. 2)
- a plurality of conductors on the conducting layer (68 in Fig. 2-5) on the first surface (Fig. 4 and 5; Col. 6, line 21), each conductor comprising grooves/raised contact members (40 and 66/68 in Fig. 2) through the conductive layer and configured for electrical connection with the semiconductor die
- a semiconductor die on the first surface in electrical communication with the conductors (die 12 in Fig. 2)

- a plurality of conductive lines/vias in the substrate/interconnect (49 in Fig. 3A) in electrical communication with the conductors (40 in Fig. 2), and

- a plurality of external contacts/balls on the second surface in electrical communication with the conductive vias (38 in Fig. 2; Col. 4, line 53)

(Fig. 2-5A; Col. 3, line 45- Col. 6, line 65).

Hembree fails to specify using a plurality of conductors defined by a plurality of laser machined grooves through the conductive layer, the conductors comprising portions of the conductive layer electrically isolated from one another by the grooves and separated by remaining portions of the conductive layer. Pedder taches using conductive stubs/grooves formed/trimmed by conventional laser trimming (Col. 2, line 25, Col. 8, line 38; Fig.2, and 9) on the conductive layer/trace of the substrate in a multichip module/ball grid package. Frankeny et al teach using conventional laser drilling or punching of metal (Fig. 5; Col. 5, line 63- Col. 5, line 9) to define a plurality of conductors/contacts (98 in Fig. 5) through the conductive layer (copper layer in Fig. 5) where the conductors comprise portions of the conductive layer electrically isolated from one another by the grooves and separated by remaining portions of the conductive layer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate a plurality of conductors defined by a plurality of laser machined grooves through the conductive layer, the conductors comprising portions of the conductive layer electrically isolated from one another by the grooves and separated by remaining portions of the conductive layer

laser machined grooves formed the conductive layer to improve the electrical performance of the contacts/device using Frankeny et al's laser drilled conductors in Hembree's component.

Regarding claims 26 and 27, Hembree discloses a semiconductor die flip chip mounted or wire bonded to the a plurality of bond pads on the conductors/substrate (56/60 in Fig. 4; Col. 6, line 21). Furthermore, Pedder taches using a multichip module/ball grid package where the a semiconductor chip or multichip can be mounted on the conductors using conventional wire bond or flip chip connections (Fig. 2; Col. 2, line 36; Col. 4, line 28; Col. 4, line 50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate a plurality of dice flip chip mounted or wire bonded to the conductors to achieve multichip connection capability using Pedder and Frankeny et al's's module design in Hembree's component.

Regarding claim 28, Hembree discloses a the substrate comprising a material selected from the group consisting of plastic, glass filled resin, silicon and ceramic (Col. 2, line 17-33; Col. 6, line 35).

Regarding claim 29, Hembree discloses external contacts comprising balls in a ball/grid array (Fig. 2-3A; Col. 4, line 48).

3. Claims 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hembree (prior art-IDS, US Pat. 5783461) in view of Frankeny et al (US Pat. 5065227) and Pedder (US Pat. 5717245).

Regarding claims 30-32, Hembree discloses a semiconductor component/package comprising:

- a composite substrate/interconnect (14/16 in Fig. 2) comprising a surface with a conductive layer/traces (40, 56 and 58 in Fig. 2 and 4) having a thickness

- a plurality of conductors having width and thickness (40, 56, 58 and 60 in Fig. 2, 4 and 5) on the first surface (Fig. 4 and 5; Col. 6, line 21), each conductor comprising grooves/raised contact members (40, 58, 60, 66, 68, etc. in Fig. 2, 4 and 5) through the conductive layer (Fig. 2-5A; Col. 3, line 45- Col. 6, line 65), the conductor including a plurality of first pads (60 in Fig. 4-5A)

- a semiconductor die mounted on the substrate, the die comprising a plurality of second pads bonded (62 in Fig. 5A) to the first pads (Col. 6, line 25)

- a plurality of conductive lines/vias in the substrate/interconnect (49 in Fig. 3A) in electrical communication with the conductors (40 in Fig. 2), and

- a plurality of external contacts on the second surface in electrical communication with the conductive vias (38 in Fig. 2; Col. 4, line 53)

(Fig. 2-5A; Col. 3, line 45- Col. 6, line 65).

Hembree fails to specify using a plurality of pairs of laser machined grooves through the conductive layer, the conductors comprising portions of the conductive layer electrically isolated on either side by a pair of laser machined grooves. As explained above for claim 25, Frankeny et al and Pedder teaach using conventional laser drilling or punching of metal (Fig. 5; Col. 5, line 63- Col. 5, line 9) to define a plurality of conductors/contact pads through the conductive layer (copper layer in Fig. 5) where the conductors comprise portions of the conductive layer electrically isolated from one another by a plurality of pairs of laser machined grooves. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate a plurality of pairs of laser machined grooves through the conductive layer, the conductors comprising portions of the conductive layer electrically isolated on either side by a pair of laser machined grooves to improve the electrical performance of the contacts/device using Frankeny et al and Pedder's laser drilled conductors in Hembree's semiconductor component.

Claim 33 is rejected as explained above for claims 30 and 25-27.

Regarding claim 34, Hembree fails to specify using an encapsulant covering the die and a portion of the surface. Peddler teaches using the conventional sealant/encapsulant to encapsulate the BGA package/module in the chip packaging art (Col. 1, line 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use an

encapsulant covering the die and a portion of the surface to provide added protection in Hembree's semiconductor component.

4. Claims 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hembree (prior art-IDS, US Pat. 5783461) in view of Frankeny et al (US Pat. 5065227) and Pedder (US Pat. 5717245).

The combined teachings of Hembree, Frankeny et al and Pedder apply to claims 35 and 37 as explained above for claims 30 and 25.

Claim 36 is rejected as explained above for claims 35 and 34.

Claims 38 and 39 are rejected as explained above for claims 35, 25 and 28.

5. Claims 47-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hembree (prior art-IDS, US Pat. 5783461) in view of Frankeny et al (US Pat. 5065227) and Pedder (US Pat. 5717245).

The combined teachings of Hembree, Frankeny et al and Pedder as explained above for claims 25, 30; 27 and 26 apply to claims 47, 48, and 49 respectively.

The combined teachings of Hembree, Frankeny et al and Pedder apply to claims 50 and 51 as explained above for claim 25.

6. Claims 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hembree (prior art-IDS, US Pat. 5783461) in view of Frankeny et al (US Pat. 5065227) and Pedder (US Pat. 5717245) as explained above for claim 25.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Papers related to this application may be submitted directly to Art Unit 2811 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit via Technology Center 2800 fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (15 November 1989).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nitin Parekh whose telephone number in (703) 305-3410. The examiner can be normally reached on Monday-Friday from 08:30 am-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas, can be reached on (703) 308-2772. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722 or 7724.

Nitin Parekh

06-25-01

Tom Thomas

TOM THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER